MEETING OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

First Vice President Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

Second Vice President Greg Pettis, Cathedral City

Immediate Past President Larry McCallon, Highland

Executive/Administration Committee Chair

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and Human Development Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment Margaret Clark, Rosemead

Transportation Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 10, 2012 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

SCAG Offices 818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor Board Room Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 236-1800

Videoconferencing is available with a 72-hour advance notice by contacting Margaret Lin at lin@scag.ca.gov or 213-236-1866.

Teleconferencing Information:

Number: 1-800-288-8961

Silent Live Web PowerPoint Presentations:

https://www.webmeeting.att.com

Meeting #: 8772145010 | Participant Code: 159785

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Margaret Lin at 213-236-1866 or lin@scag.ca.gov

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1866 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1866.

January 2012

Charlie Larwood, Chair Kevin Viera. Vice-Chair

Member Representing

Alan De Salvio Antelope Valley AQMD/Mojave Desert AQMD

Bill Trimble San Gabriel Valley COG Carol A. Gomez South Coast AQMD

Charlie Larwood Orange County Transportation Authority

Danielle Coats WRCOG

Dave Simpson Orange County COG

David Cordero SCAG Regional Special Districts

Deborah Diep OCCOG

Diana Chang Westside Cities COG Eric Shen Port of Long Beach

Franklin Dancy Morongo Band of Mission Indians

Fred Zohrehvand Arroyo Verdugo
Genie McGaugh Ventura County APCD

Gloria Ohland Move LA Gregory Nord OCTA

Kerry Cartwright
Kevin Viera
Western Riverside COG
Kim Fuentes
South Bay Cities COG
Lisa Webber
North LA County - South
Lori Abrishami
Los Angeles County Metro
Marc Seferian
Las Virgenes/Malibu COG

Marianne Kim American Automobile Association
Mark Baza Imperial County Transportation Commission

Mark Herwick County of Los Angeles

Mark Herwick County of Los Angeles
Mark Roberts Caltrans District 8

Marlon Boarnet UCI Department of Planning, Policy and Design

Matt Dessert Imperial County APCD
Maureen El Harake Caltrans District 12
Maurice Eaton Caltrans District 11
Melissa Joshi Caltrans District 7

Michael Hollis Metropolitan Water District of Southern

California

Miles Mitchell City of Los Angeles
Nancy Pfeffer Gateway Cities COG
Richard Kite North LA County - North
Ryan Snyder Non-Motorized Transportation

Sera Wirth SCAG Region Local Agency Formation

Commissions

Shirley Medina Riverside County Transportation Commission

Steve De George Ventura County Transportation

Commission/Ventura COG

Steve Smith San Bernardino Associated Governments

Terry Roberts Air Resources Board

Ty Schuiling San Bernardino Associated Governments
Valarie McFall Transportation Corridor Agencies
Valerie Edwards Los Angeles Unified School District

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE JANUARY 10, 2012

TIME PG#

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

(Charlie Larwood, OCTA and P&P TAC Chair)

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee, must fill out and present a speaker's card to the assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty minutes.

3.0 REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 **Approval Item**

4.1.1 Minutes of October 12, 2011 P&P TAC Meeting

1

Presentation: 10 min

Discussion: 90 min

5.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 <u>Draft 2012-2035 RTP/SCS</u> (Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff)

Review, discuss and provide an opportunity to the members for initial feedback on the Draft 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

The Draft 2012-2035 RTP/SCS may be viewed at: http://www.scagrtp.net/

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the P&P TAC will be to be determined.



Meeting of the

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC) of the Southern California Association of Governments

October 12, 2011

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN AND/OR DISCUSSIONS BY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE. AUDIO OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES OFFICE.

The Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee held its October 12, 2011 meeting at SCAG's downtown Los Angeles Office.

Members Present

Charlie Larwood Orange County Transportation Authority

Bill Trimble San Gabriel Valley COG
Danny Wu South Coast AQMD
Dave Simpson Orange County COG
Diana Chang Westside Cities COG

Earl Withycombe Air Resources Board – Alternate

Genie McGaugh Ventura County APCD

Gloria Ohland Move LA Gregory Nord OCTA

James Camarillo Caltrans District 8 – Alternate

Kerry Cartwright Port of Los Angeles

Lisa Webber North LA County – South Lori Abrishami Los Angeles County Metro Marc Seferian Las Virgenes/Malibu COG

Marianne Kim American Automobile Association

Mark Baza Imperial County Transportation Commission

Martha Eros Westside Cities COG – Alternate

Maureen El Harake Caltrans District 12 Melissa Joshi Caltrans District 7

Mike Behen North LA County - North – Alternate

Miles Mitchell
Nancy Pfeffer
Richard Kite
Ryan Snyder

City of Los Angeles
Gateway Cities COG
North LA County – North
Non-Motorized Transportation

Steve De George Ventura County Transportation Commission/Ventura COG

Steve Smith San Bernardino Associated Governments

Terry Roberts Air Resources Board

Valarie McFall Transportation Corridor Agencies

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC) Minutes October 12, 2011 Page 2

Walter Siembab South Bay Cities COG – Alternate William Gayk Riverside County Planning Department

Members Excused

Marlon Boarnet UCI Department of Planning, Policy and Design

Members Not Present

Members Not Presen	
Aimee Kratovil	Federal Highway Administration – Alternate
Alan Ballard	Ventura County APCD – Alternate
Alan De Salvio	Antelope Valley AQMD/Mojave Desert AQMD
Aurora Wilson	Coachella Valley AG – Alternate
Beth Landrum	Caltrans District 11 – Alternate
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies – Alternate
Carol A. Gomez	South Coast AQMD
Connie Chung	County of Los Angeles – Alternate
Dave Peterson	North LA County - South – Alternate
David Cordero	SCAG Regional Special Districts
Deborah Diep	OCCOG
Dianna Watson	Caltrans District 7 – Alternate
Eric Shen	Port of Long Beach
Everrett Evans	Caltrans District 12 – Alternate
Fernando Castro	Caltrans District 7 – Alternate
Franklin Dancy	Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Fred Zohrehvand	Arroyo Verdugo
Grace Alvarez	Riverside County Transportation Commission - Alternate
Jolene Hayes	Port of Long Beach – Alternate
Karen Heit	Gateway Cities COG – Alternate
Kathryn Higgins	South Coast AQMD – Alternate
Kevin Viera	Western Riverside COG
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Larry Stevens	San Gabriel Valley COG – Alternate
Mark Herwick	County of Los Angeles
Mark Roberts	Caltrans District 8
Mary E. Pritchard	Los Angeles Unified School District - Alternate
Matt Dessert	Imperial County APCD
Maurice Eaton	Caltrans District 11
Michael Hollis	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Monica N. Soucier	Imperial County APCD – Alternate
Naomi Guth	City of Los Angeles – Alternate
Rosa Lopez-Solis	Imperial County Transportation Commission - Alternate

Sarah Jepson	Los Angeles County Metro – Alternate
Sera Wirth	SCAG Region Local Agency Formation Commissions
Shirley Medina	Riverside County Transportation Commission
Stephen Finnegan	American Automobile Association – Alternate
Ty Schuiling	San Bernardino Associated Governments
Valerie Edwards	Los Angeles Unified School District

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Charlie Larwood, OCTA & P&PTAC Chair.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Larwood noted a request has been made to present a public comment during agenda item 5.3, RTP Alternatives Description.

3.0 REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Larwood stated agenda item 5.2 SCAG Draft Public Participation Plan is being moved to item 5.1. The other items will follow as ordered.

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 **Approval Item**

4.1.1 Minutes of September 13, 2011 P&P TAC Meeting

There were no requested revisions and the minutes were approved as submitted.

5.0 <u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>

5.1 SCAG Draft Public Participation Plan

Angela Rushen, SCAG Staff, presented an update on SCAG's Draft Public Participation Plan, Amendment Number 3. Ms. Rushen stated it is SCAG's goal to insure the public is involved in the regional decision making process and the plan serves as a guide to insure processes are accessible to the public.

Ms. Rushen stated the plan has been recently revised and is available for review and public comment through November 7, 2011. Further, Ms. Rushen noted the plan is being updated to make appropriate revisions relating to the 2012 draft RTP/SCS as well as recent technology enhancements which allow more effective outreach to the public.

Ms. Rushen stated the plan is available for public viewing at www.scag.ca.gov under "Public Participation Plan" and comments can be submitted as well. Ms. Rushen stated she is available to receive any comments regarding the plan.

There were no questions for Ms. Rushen and Chair Larwood concluded the item.

5.2 Environmental Justice Analysis Framework

Frank Wen, SCAG Staff, provided an update on Environmental Justice Analysis Framework. Mr. Wen stated SCAG's Environmental Justice Analysis is robust and examines the effect of transportation and other programs on specific populations such as ethnic minorities, seniors, the disabled and low income groups. Mr. Wen stated a region-wide analysis is conducted that seeks to answer two principle questions, 1) Are people better off or worse with or without a particular program?, and 2) Is there a disproportionate negative impact on any group?

Mr. Wen stated key components of analysis include: 1) transportation models and tools, 2) geographic, Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ), 3) socioeconomic variables, 4) the Regional Transportation Plan, 5) SCAG's Regional Travel Demand Model & Networks and Direct Transportation Impact Model (DTIM), and, 6) performance outcomes (is travel time decreased and congestion relieved).

Mr. Wen noted several different geographic areas are used although much of the analysis begins with the Traffic Analysis Zones. Further, Mr. Wen identified the specific modeling components including, 1) transportation model including passenger car, transit and non-motorized, 2) truck model, 3) pricing model, 4) air passenger model, 5) air cargo model, and 6) air quality model.

Mr. Wen stated Traffic Analysis Zones are used to understand specific transportation use and the parcel is used to determine the effectiveness of land use. Additional model outcomes/indicators include VMTs which help determine the effectiveness of reducing travel time and congestion. Further Mr. Wen noted other model information useful in Environmental Justice analysis includes traffic volumes, hours of delay, average speed and mode share. Additional analysis is useful in examining, 1) mobility (speed and delay), 2) accessibility (access to opportunities), 3) reliability (day-to-day trip time variation), 4) productivity (system performance during peak hours).

Next, Mr. Wen reviewed the socioeconomic elements analyzed. These include a breakdown of populations by ethnic groups, by income (such as poverty level), by age (including seniors), gender and the disabled. Further, Mr. Wen stated there have been enhancements in analysis over time which include improved ability to analyze accessibility (employment opportunities), air pollutants, travel time savings (transit and auto), auto travel distance reductions, RTP plan expenditures/investments, sales tax and gasoline tax burdens.

For the 2012 RTP, Mr. Wen noted several areas will be examined including, focus on non-motorized transportation, identify and quantify the primary environmental justice challenges in transportation, bring public health to the forefront by focusing on pollutants, analyze the effects of gentrification, urban infill and Transit Oriented Development and examine potential steps to mitigate any adverse effects. Mr. Wen noted new areas of analysis including gentrification displacement, air quality impacts along freeways and highly traveled corridors, railed related impacts and impacts of pricing strategies.

Mr. Wen further stated current analysis permits a detailed examination of the 500 foot buffer zone around freeways and major arterials. This analysis provides details of those in the buffer zone compared to the region. Further, Mr. Wen stated details can include for example, employment, age and race within the zone.

Mr. Wen further stated information can be gathered from transit oriented communities to determine the effects of transit initiatives and likely impacts of gentrification. Mr. Wen concluded by noting thorough analysis is useful in examining the effect of transportation and other programs on specific populations. Particularly, it can measure the displacement of low income

and minority populations as the result of urban infill and TOD development.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion. Ryan Snyder asked for a summary of the elements relating to policy. Mr. Wen stated the environmental justice analysis for the 2012 RTP is very robust and can uncover likely negative impacts of transportation and land use programs upon specific populations including low income, minorities, seniors and the disabled. Mr. Wen stated there is preliminary evidence that low income and minority populations bear a greater burden of these programs in the areas of health outcome, exposure to pollutants and displacement.

Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities COG, asked about the analysis related to transit oriented community and how that is defined geographically. Mr. Wen stated it is one-half miles within a rail station for the study presented to the TAC.

5.3 **RTP Alternatives Description**

This item began with a public comment from Gail Shiomoto-Lohr, City of Mission Viejo. Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr stated she will present a few questions relating to the 2012 RTP alternatives for a later staff response. Regarding Alternative B and its strategy to shift housing and jobs within jurisdictions, Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr asked that jurisdictions receive full communication regarding any job and housing shifts. For Alternative C which seeks to shift jobs and housing across jurisdictional boundaries, Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr asks if this includes shifting them across counties. Next, Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr asked about funding for system maintenance and preservation. Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr asked if the greater level of system preservation funding is in Alternative B or C.

Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff, presented an update on RTP alternatives. Mr. Amatya stated the RTP Alternatives were presented to the Regional Council followed by discussion on October 6, 2011. Mr. Amatya stated several guiding principles were used to develop the alternatives including consideration of economic development and competitiveness. It was further stated alternatives planning sought to respect existing county transportation decisions and to integrate the subregional Sustainable Communities Strategies. Additionally, system preservation would be given a higher priority in the use of new revenues and each alternative would be

evaluated under a set of performance measures. There was also a focus on providing transportation strategies supportive of sustainable development.

Mr. Amatya stated each of the alternatives incorporates embedded county projects which are best represented in the 2008 RTP, amendment 4. Mr. Amatya stated the primary differences among alternatives include, 1) socioeconomic and land use assumptions, 2) congestion pricing and revenue generation strategies, and, 3) incremental spending from new revenues on transportation preservation, transit, environmental mitigation, regional projects and non-motorized.

Mr. Amatya reviewed the three proposed alternatives. Mr. Amatya stated Alternative A includes transportation projects currently committed as reflected in the 2008 RTP. It also embeds progressive land use as reflected in the locally supported SED input and it includes significant investments in transit. Mr. Amatya stated the goal of Alternative A is to assess to what extent we can achieve conformity, meet SB 375 requirements and maintain transportation infrastructure performance. Mr. Amatya stated it is likely Alternative A will not meet greenhouse gas reduction targets required per SB 375.

Mr. Amatya stated Alternative B builds upon Alternative A and is the preferred staff alternative. Further, Mr. Amatya stated growth projections for Alternative B will be based on local projections but will also seek to shift growth within jurisdictions to maximize TOD and transit priority areas in an effort to gain efficiencies. Further, Mr. Amatya stated funding gaps would be addressed by a suite of pricing strategies such as tolls on the I-710 truck lane, a strategic HOT lane network, cordon pricing and user fees. Additionally, an increase in the excise tax will be examined.

Mr. Amatya further stated Alternative B includes the High Speed Rail initiative Phase I which regionally links Palmdale to Union Station and further to Anaheim. Mr. Amatya stated Alternative B seeks an additional \$50 billion for system preservation and to maintain current transportation infrastructure at its current condition. Mr. Amatya further stated Alternative B includes all the goods movement projects from the County Transportation Commissions including the east-west freight corridor and potentially I-15 beyond the SR 60.

Mr. Amatya stated additional goals of Alternative B include increased funding for bike and pedestrian transportation projects as well as TDM and

TSM. Additionally, Metro's 30/10 initiative is assumed under Alternative B. Mr. Amatya stated additional projects under Alternative B include targeted expansion of existing and planned fixed guideways to close gaps in the system, additional services on highly utilized corridors, additional BRT service on targeted corridors as well as express service on proposed HOT lane network.

Mr. Amatya stated the land use portion of Alternative B reflects local input to better reflect emerging trends. Further, Mr. Amatya stated it seeks to increase or decrease housing and/or jobs in certain jurisdictions based on the adequacy of infrastructure. Additionally, it emphasizes both residential and employment development in Transportation Priority Project Areas as well as meet expected demand for a broader range of housing types with focus on smaller-lot single family homes, townhomes and multifamily condominiums and apartments.

Next, Mr. Amatya reviewed funding options. Mr. Amatya stated the total cost of current commitments is approximately \$350 billion and the amount of revenue available is approximately \$305 billion leaving an approximately \$35 – \$45 billion funding gap. This does not include any of the new funding alternatives under consideration for the 2012 RTP.

Mr. Amatya next presented options for addressing future funding shortfalls. Mr. Amatya stated if the funding gap were addressed with an increase in the gas tax it would require increasing it from the current level of 54 cents per gallon to 90 cents per gallon. Or, enact a 3.3 cents per mile use fee. Further, Mr. Amatya added if the regional initiatives currently under consideration are included it would widen the funding shortfall to \$55 to \$65 billion. In order to address this shortfall it would require increasing the gasoline tax to \$1.07 per gallon, or, alternatively, enact a 3.9 cents per mile user fee.

Mr. Amatya, further stated funding for Operation, Maintenance and Preservation total an additional \$50 billion to maintain the system in its current condition, creating a total funding shortfall of \$100 to \$110 billion. Mr. Amatya stated addressing this imbalance would mean increasing the gas tax to \$1.54 per gallon, or, addressing it with a user fee would require a fee of 5.6 cents per mile. Mr. Amatya stated achieving a state of good repair would bring O & M and preservation cost to \$70 billion. Balancing the funding shortfall would require increasing the gas tax to \$1.73 cents per gallon, or, if addressed with a user fee would require a 6.3 cents per mile

user fee. Mr. Amatya noted Alternative B seeks to meet federal and state requirements, provide more travel choices, improve mobility and accessibility, improve transportation asset conditions and generate more jobs.

Mr. Amatya stated Alternative C strategically builds off of Alternative B particularly in land use where it seeks to strategically shift household and jobs across jurisdictions to achieve a better job/housing balance. It seeks additional growth in fixed guideway transit oriented development districts and includes additional investments in transit, bicycle, pedestrian, as well as TDM to support more progressive land use.

Mr. Amatya further noted that a fourth alternative, currently titled Alternative D, reviews a scenario where fuel cost doubles to \$8 per gallon by 2035. This scenario examines what the effect would be on SB 375 conformity, the increase in transit share, the number of trips eliminated, the reduction in VMT, congestion as well as greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Amatya stated the next steps include further review of the alternatives at the October 20, 2011 Regional Council meeting and the recommendation by the council of a preferred alternative at the November 3, 2011 meeting. It is anticipated the Regional Council will release the draft of the 2012 RTP/SCS for public review and comments at the December 1, 2011 meeting.

Further, Mr. Amatya stated there will be outreach workshops in January and February 2012 to receive public comments and it is anticipated the RTP/SCS will be approved by the Regional Council on April 5, 2012.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion. Ryan Snyder, Non-Motorized Transportation, asked about the amount projected for bicycle and pedestrian transportation. Mr. Amatya stated bicycle and pedestrian are being prioritized in this RTP, however, it is not known at this time the amount of the final budget. Mr. Snyder noted there is a finite amount of oil remaining to be extracted and by 2035 the price per gallon may not only be prohibitive but oil may be in limited supply. Mr. Snyder suggested perhaps Alternative D can consider future transportation planning in the light of diminishing fuel availability.

Marianne Kim, Automobile Club of California asked if congestion pricing revenue would go toward system preservation. Mr. Amatya stated Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC) Minutes October 12, 2011 Page 10

preliminary understanding is it would go first to system preservation but could also be used for other initiatives.

Chair Larwood asked if cordon pricing would be limited to the freeway system. Mr. Amatya stated it would be more expansive.

6.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Potential Recommendations from the Freight Works Study Congestion Pricing Update Preliminary Modeling Results East-West Corridor Business Plan

7.0 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held Tuesday, November 8, 2011 from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.